arXiv:gr-qc/9604051v1 26 Apr 1996

UCSBTH-96-07
gr-qc/9604051

THE ORIGIN OF BLACK HOLE ENTROPY IN STRING THEORY[1]

Gary T. HOROWITZ[2]

Department of Physics,
University of California,
Santa Barbara, CA. 93106 USA

Abstract

I review some recent work in which the quantum states of string theory which are associated with certain black holes have been identified and counted. For large black holes, the number of states turns out to be precisely the exponential of the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy. This provides a statistical origin for black hole thermodynamics in the context of a potential quantum theory of gravity.

I. Introduction

When I was first asked to give a title for this talk, two months before the conference, I chose "Gravitational insights from string theory". By the time the conference began, I had changed my title to "Can string theory answer fundamental questions in gravitational physics?" As I finish writing up this contribution for the proceedings, now two months after the conference, my title has changed again. I hope this illustrates, not my inability to stick to one topic, but rather the rapid pace of progress in this field. This is an exciting time in string theory. There have been major developments in several different directions. New results have been appearing almost every week. Since it is not possible to review all aspects of this work here, I have chosen one topic that I believe is of most interest to the community of gravitational physicists. Even with this restriction, it is difficult to review such a rapidly evolving field, but I will try to summarize our current understanding.

[1]To appear in the proceedings of the Pacific Conference on Gravitation and Cosmology, Seoul, Korea, February 1-6, 1996.

[2]e-mail: gary@cosmic.physics.ucsb.edu

The early days of string theory were largely devoted to developing the perturbative expansion of the theory. However, the recent progress has lead to an understanding of a number of nonperturbative effects. With this progress, string theory is finally at a stage where it can begin to answer fundamental questions such as: What is the origin of black hole entropy?

This question goes back over twenty years to the early 1970's. At that time it was noticed that there was a striking similarity between the laws of black hole mechanics [1, 2] which include

$$dM = \frac{1}{8\pi G}\kappa dA, \qquad \delta A \geq 0 \tag{1}$$

(where κ is the surface gravity and A is the area of the event horizon) and the laws of thermodynamics

$$dE = TdS, \qquad \delta S \geq 0. \tag{2}$$

Hawking showed [3] that this was more than an analogy with his famous discovery that black holes indeed radiate a thermal spectrum with temperature $T = \hbar\kappa/2\pi$. This implies that black holes have an entropy equal to one quarter of their horizon area in Planck units: $S_{BH} = A/4G\hbar$. Thus general relativity and quantum field theory in curved spacetime give a beautiful thermodynamic description of black holes. But thermodynamics is only an approximation to a more fundamental description based on statistical mechanics. The challenge has been to find this more fundamental description, and find the the $e^{S_{BH}}$ states associated with a black hole. Since the black hole temperature is a quantum mechanical effect (proportional to $\hbar$) the statistical description must presumably involve a quantum theory of gravity, which makes this problem particularly difficult.

String theory is a promising candidate for a quantum theory of gravity, and it has recently provided an answer to this question for a certain class of black holes. (For some earlier work, see [4 - 17].) Since there have been several strange black holes discussed in the context of string theory, let me emphasize that we will consider ordinary four (or five) dimensional black holes and not black holes in lower dimension, massless black holes, or black holes with zero horizon area (although these latter objects will play a role at an intermediate stage in our discussion).

Before we begin, let me clarify a point which may later cause confusion. As relativists, we are used to setting Newton's constant G equal to one, and measuring mass in units of length. In string theory, there is another fundamental length scale l_s called the string scale which is set by the string tension $T \sim 1/l_s^2$. Newton's constant is related to l_s by $G \sim g^2 l_s^2$ (in four dimensions) where g is the string coupling constant. Although one could still set $G = 1$, it is often more convenient to set $l_s = 1$ (as well as $\hbar = 1$) since masses of string states are multiples of $1/l_s$. The gravitational field produced by these states depends on G and increases with the string coupling.

Another reason for not setting G to one is that Newton's constant is dimension dependent. If we consider five dimensional general relativity and restrict to spacetimes with a translational symmetry in a compact direction of length L asymptotically, then it is natural to set $G_5 = G_4 L$. This is because the four dimensional reduced action then takes the standard form

$$\frac{1}{16\pi G_5}\int d^5x\sqrt{-g_5}R_5 = \frac{1}{16\pi G_4}\int d^4x\sqrt{-g_4}(R_4 + \cdots) \tag{3}$$

where the dots denote matter fields that arise from the dimensional reduction. This is important for understanding the entropy of extended black holes. Consider the five dimensional vacuum solution which is the product of the four dimensional Schwarzschild metric and a circle of length L. Since the horizon area is proportional to L, one might think that the entropy is also proportional to L. But the entropy is $A/4$ in Planck units, and these units are different in four and five dimensions. In fact

$$\frac{A_5}{4G_5} = \frac{A_4}{4G_4} \tag{4}$$

so the entropy is independent of L can be calculated in either dimension with the same result.

In the next section, I discuss in general terms the explanation of black hole entropy provided by string theory. In section III, some more details are provided by considering an explicit example. Section IV contains further discussion of these recent results and some open problems.

II. Black Hole Entropy

To begin our discussion, let me briefly review some basic aspects of string theory. One starts with the assumption that fundamentally, all particles are excitations of a one dimensional extended object - a string. When this string is quantized in flat spacetime, one finds an infinite tower of states. There are a finite number of massless fields which include a scalar field (called the dilaton) whose asymptotic value determines the string coupling g, gauge fields, and a spin two field identified with the graviton. Thus, one mode of the string corresponds to a linearized perturbation of the metric. For every integer N, there are massive states with $M^2 = N/l_s^2$. These massive states have a large degeneracy. The number of states with mass M grows roughly like e^M. One might wonder whether this degeneracy has something to do with black hole entropy, but at least naively it does not seem to work[3]: The number of black hole states should grow like e^{M^2} not e^M. We will see that the explanation of black hole entropy is more subtle.

Strings interact by a simple splitting and joining interaction so the two dimensional worldsheet remains smooth. Classical graviton scattering computed this

[3]See [8] for a less naive interpretation in which a resolution of this discrepancy is proposed.

way agrees with the perturbative expansion of general relativity. But string theory is not just a theory in flat spacetime. When strings are quantized in curved spacetime, there is a consistency condition which yields an equation of motion for the spacetime metric and other massless fields, as well as a restriction on the spacetime dimension. In the simplest case, this requires ten dimensions. The equation for the spacetime metric takes the form of Einstein's equation with matter consisting of the other massless fields in the theory, plus an infinite series of higher order terms multiplied by powers of the string length l_s. The first part of the equation of motion (not multiplied by powers of l_s) is called the 'low energy string equation'. When the curvature is small compared to $1/l_s^2$ the higher order terms are negligible and the theory reduces to general relativity coupled to certain matter fields. When the curvature is of order $1/l_s^2$ or greater, the higher order terms are important. In fact, in this case, the metric may not be well defined. This is because the theory does not prefer $g_{\mu\nu}$ over $g_{\mu\nu} + l_s^2 R_{\mu\nu} + ...$ where the dots denote arbitrary second rank tensors constructed from the curvature and its derivatives. Since l_s is roughly the size of a string, one can view this as saying that the metric is only well defined on length scales larger than a string.

A key step in the recent developments was the realization that in addition to the states described by string fluctuations, there are also soliton states in the theory. Solitons are static, finite energy classical solutions to the field equations. In string theory there are several types of solitons. Two are familiar from field theories; nonsingular magnetic monopoles, and black holes. Since string theory is naturally formulated in higher spacetime dimensions, there also exist extended monopoles and extended objects surrounded by horizons called black strings, black membranes, and more generally, black p-branes for p dimensional extended objects. Solutions to the low energy string equations of this type have been known for some time, and since the curvature is small at the horizon for large black holes, these should be close to exact string solutions. (For a recent review, see [18].) However, except for the familiar monopoles, it was not clear what role these solitons should play in the quantum theory. Quantum mechanically, the black holes and black p-branes are not stable due to Hawking radiation. This radiation is absent for the extremely charged solutions, so we are lead to focus on them. Unfortunately, there is an immediate problem. Due to the coupling to the dilaton, the extremal limit of black holes and black p-branes with a single type of charge is quite different from the Reissner-Nordström solution. In string theory, the dilaton diverges at the inner horizon causing this surface to become singular. As one approaches the extremal limit, the event horizon approaches this "inner horizon" and becomes singular itself[4]. To obtain the quantum states associated with a soliton, one usually identifies its zero modes (or collective coordinates) and quantizes them. This is not possible when the soliton is singular.

[4]Of course, once the curvature exceeds the string scale, one cannot usually trust the solution to the low energy equations. However, in some cases, one can argue that the low energy extremal solutions are in fact exact even when the curvature diverges [19].

To resolve this problem, we need two ingredients. The first is supersymmetry. In theories where the supersymmetry algebra has a central charge, one can prove a general inequality on the mass and charge of all perturbative states: $M \geq kQ$ where k is a constant which can depend on the parameters in the theory. States which saturate this bound are called BPS states, and have the important property that their mass cannot receive quantum corrections. The number of BPS states is essentially a topological invariant, and does not change if one continuously changes the coupling constant, or other parameters in the theory. (This is because BPS states form short representations of the supersymmetry algebra, and the number of degrees of freedom cannot change when the parameters are varied.)

The second ingredient is a better understanding of the charges that exist in string theory. There are two basic types of gauge fields called $\mathcal{NS}$ (for Neveu-Schwarz) and $\mathcal{R}$ (for Ramond) and they can carry either electric or magnetic type charge. Both types of fields exist in the low energy string action, and one can find solitons with each of these charges. These fields differ in how the dilaton couples to them. The charges are all quantized, and the difference in coupling leads to a difference in the mass of an extremal soliton with one unit of charge. In units with $l_s = 1$, the mass of an extremal soliton with one unit of electric $\mathcal{NS}$ charge is of order one, the mass of a soliton with one unit of magnetic $\mathcal{NS}$ charge is of order $1/g^2$, and with one unit of $\mathcal{R}$ charge (either electric or magnetic) is of order $1/g$. So when the string coupling g is very small, the $\mathcal{R}$ charged solitons and magnetic $\mathcal{NS}$ charged solitons are both very massive.

We now ask what is the gravitational field of these objects at weak coupling when $g \to 0$. The strength of this gravitational field is, of course, determined by GM. The key point is that since Newton's constant is proportional to g^2 $GM \to 0$ as $g \to 0$ for all $M < 1/g^2$. So the spacetime associated with these solitons becomes flat as $g \to 0$ not only for the electric $\mathcal{NS}$ charged objects, but also for the $\mathcal{R}$ charged ones. Since the spacetime becomes flat, there should be a *nonsingular* description of these states at weak coupling. What is this description? For the electric $\mathcal{NS}$ solitons, the weak coupling description turns out to be just (some of) the usual perturbative string states. This is because a fundamental string couples to the $\mathcal{NS}$ potential and can carry electric $\mathcal{NS}$ charge. The usual perturbative states of the (super) string satisfy $M \geq kQ$, and the BPS states with $M = kQ$ are the nonsingular weak coupling description of the extreme electric $\mathcal{NS}$ charged black holes.

At first sight, the identification of a perturbative string state with an extreme black hole may sound absurd. After all, perturbative string states, defined by quantizing a string in flat spacetime, represent linearized fluctuations about the flat background. How can they be equivalent to an extreme black hole? The answer, of course, is that the black hole represents the result of including the gravitational backreaction to the perturbative string state. As one increases the string coupling, the mass does not change (since M is independent of g classically, and supersymmetry forbids any quantum corrections). But the gravitational field

it produces becomes much stronger, and is described by a curved spacetime with large curvature. The transition point is roughly the following: If the nonlinear terms in the curved spacetime solution appear when the curvature is less than $1/l_s^2$, then the curved spacetime description is justified. If not, the flat spacetime description is better. The identification of massive BPS string states with extremal black holes has been checked by explicit calculations of large impact parameter scattering. Since scattering at large impact parameter does not probe the nonlinear part of the geometry, the scattering of BPS string states computed in string perturbation theory should agree with the scattering of extremal black holes computed in a moduli space approximation. This is indeed the case [20, 21].

What is the flat space description of extreme black holes with $\mathcal{R}$ charge? These cannot be the usual perturbative string states because strings do not carry $\mathcal{R}$ charge. This is because strings do not couple to the $\mathcal{R}$ potential but only to its field strength. The appropriate flat space description of these objects was found just last fall by Polchinski [22, 23]. Roughly speaking, one adds to the usual closed string theory a certain class of open strings whose ends are subject to Dirichlet boundary conditions. This has the effect of confining them to live on certain surfaces - called D-branes. The D stands for Dirichlet boundary conditions, *not* the dimension of the brane. D-branes can have any dimension, and one can show that they carry precisely one unit of the appropriate $\mathcal{R}$ charge. D-branes are dynamical objects and the open string states describe their fluctuations. The important point is that with this new description, the number of states with $\mathcal{R}$ charge can be counted, just like the usual perturbative string states.

With this background, I can now describe the explanation of black hole entropy that has emerged from string theory. The starting point is the observation that while black holes with a single charge have extremal limits with singular horizons, black holes carrying several different types of charge can have extremal limits with regular horizons [24]. When several gauge fields are nonzero, the dilaton can be 'stabilized' and remains finite on the horizon in the extremal limit. This allows the event horizon to remain a nonsingular surface with finite area just like the Reissner-Nordström metric. In fact, the Reissner-Nordström metric is itself a solution to string theory, but several gauge fields must be nonzero and the charge parameter in the metric is a function of the charges of each of these gauge fields. To understand black hole entropy, one views the solitons with a single charge as the elementary constituents from which one builds up extremal black holes with nonzero area. (Notice that for this interpretation, it is important that the solitons with a single charge did not have finite area horizons.) One starts at weak coupling with a BPS state with several $\mathcal{R}$ charges Q_i nonzero. This can be viewed as a bound state of several D-branes. As we increase the string coupling, the gravitational field becomes stronger and the metric becomes an extreme black hole - now with finite horizon area. Each BPS state with the same Q_i at weak coupling is described by the same black hole at strong coupling. The key question is: How many BPS states are there in the weakly coupled string theory with the

charges Q_i? For large Q_i, the answer turns out to be $e^{A/4G}$ where A is the area of the horizon that appears at strong coupling [25]! This appears almost miraculous. Unlike other attempts to explain black hole entropy, one does not start with a black hole with area A. There is no surface of area A at weak coupling. One has simply flat spacetime, and one counts states with certain charges. To the best of my knowledge, this is the first time that the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy has been obtained by counting states in a quantum theory of gravity in more than $2+1$ dimensions. (In $2+1$ dimensions, this has been achieved using the Chern-Simons formulation of the theory [14, 26].)

We have described the connection between black holes and weakly coupled string states in units where the string length l_s is fixed as the string coupling g is varied. This is useful for seeing how the flat space description arises. It turns out that in these units $A \propto g^2$ so that the entropy $A/4G$ is independent of the string coupling. This means that at weak coupling, the horizon size is much smaller than the string scale, and the horizon curvature is much larger than this scale. Hence the nonlinear terms in the metric are not reliable, and the flat space description is appropriate. As one increases the coupling, the horizon grows larger than the string scale and the black hole description becomes valid. Alternatively, one can keep the Planck length fixed as g is varied. The picture is then different. The black hole has a fixed size (independent of g) which can be large in the limit of large charge. For small g, the configuration of D-branes (which has a size of order the string scale) is much larger than the horizon radius. But as one increases g the size of the D-brane state shrinks. At a critical value of the coupling the string state undergoes gravitational collapse and falls inside the horizon. This is perhaps analogous to the maximum mass limits for white dwarfs or neutron stars[5].

The above result was first obtained for a five dimensional extreme black hole. Since then, a number of different types of black holes have been examined and the agreement between the number of string states and the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy has been shown to hold in each case. These include five dimensional extreme black holes with rotation [27], slightly nonextremal five dimensional black holes [28, 29, 30], four dimensional extreme black holes [31, 32], and slightly nonextremal four dimensional black holes [33]. (These calculations were facilitated by some earlier counting of D-brane states [34, 35, 36].) The five dimensional case was considered first since one only needs three nonzero charges to obtain an extreme black hole with regular horizon. In four dimensions, one needs four nonzero charges. The counting of states for slightly nonextremal black holes is possible since even though one must count non-BPS states, one can argue that under certain conditions, quantum corrections remain negligible. It is important to keep in mind that it is not just a single number which is being calculated in two different ways with the same result. For nonextremal four dimensional black holes, the entropy is a function of several parameters including the mass, and four

[5]I thank J. Polchinski for suggesting this viewpoint.

different charges. The number of string states agrees with the black hole entropy as a function of all of these parameters.

III. Examples

Many of the $\mathcal{NS}$ charges in string theory arise from compactifying one or more spacetime directions. In addition to the usual Kaluza-Klein gauge field which arises from the metric in the usual way, there is another gauge field coming from the dimensional reduction of a three form $H_{\mu\nu\rho}$ which appears as a massless field in string theory. From the way that a string couples to the metric and H, one can show that a string with momentum in a compact direction carries electric Kaluza-Klein charge, while a string that winds around a compact direction carries electric charge associated with H. Consider flat spacetime with one direction x compactified with radius R. Examples of BPS states with one type of charge are an unexcited string wrapped m times around the circle (with no momentum), or an unexcited string with momentum $P_x = n/R$ (and no winding). These are both examples of electric $\mathcal{NS}$ charges since they are carried by a fundamental string. For each value of the charge there is just one quantum BPS state with that charge (apart from the degeneracy of the supersymmetry multiplet). When both charges are nonzero, there are many BPS states, since it turns out that the oscillators associated with either the left moving modes or right moving modes (but not both) can be excited. The extreme black hole with two charges still has a singular horizon, but if one draws a surface where the curvature reaches the string scale (indicating the boundary where the metric can no longer be trusted), then it turns out that its area correctly counts the number of BPS string states with two charges (up to an overall factor of order one arising from the fact that the location of the surface has not been precisely specified) [11, 12]. One can interpret this roughly as resulting from the fact that the number of BPS states with two charges only grows like e^M, which is not fast enough for the horizon size to become larger than the string scale.

To obtain an extreme black hole with finite area, we need to consider more than two charges. We will discuss the simplest example, which is a five dimensional black hole with three charges. To understand the quantum states associated with this black hole, it is more convenient to consider a six dimensional black string. As discussed in the introduction, the entropy of the black string will be the same as the black hole obtained by dimensional reduction. (For a more detailed discussion of this example, see [29, 37].) Since string theory requires ten dimensions, we assume that the remaining four dimensions are compactified on a fixed torus of volume $(2\pi)^4 V$ which is constant. We will also assume that the dilaton is constant. The only nontrivial field besides the metric is then the three form $H_{\mu\nu\rho}$. For six dimensional solutions with a spacelike translational symmetry, H can carry both electric and magnetic charges which are proportional to the integral of $*H$ and

H over the asymptotic three sphere in the space orthogonal to the symmetry direction. These charges are quantized and take integer values which we will denote by Q_1 and Q_5. (The reason for this notation will become clear shortly.) The solution to the low energy string equations turns out to be [38]

$$ds^2 = -\left(1-\frac{r_+^2}{r^2}\right)dt^2 + \left(1-\frac{r_-^2}{r^2}\right)dx^2 \quad + \left(1-\frac{r_+^2}{r^2}\right)^{-1}\left(1-\frac{r_-^2}{r^2}\right)^{-1}dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega_3^2 \tag{5}$$

This metric is similar to the five dimensional Reissner-Nordström solution. There is an event horizon at $r = r_+$ and an inner horizon at $r = r_-$. It is static, spherically symmetric, and translationally invariant along the x direction. The parameters r_+ and r_- are related to the charges by $Q_1 Q_5 = r_+^2 r_-^2 V/g^2$. The extremal limit corresponds to $r_+ = r_- \equiv r_0$. If we periodically identify x with period $2\pi R$, the extremal ADM energy is

$$E_0 = \frac{2r_0^2 RV}{g^2} \tag{6}$$

where we have used the fact that the six dimensional Newton's constant is $G = \pi^2 g^2/2V$ in units with $l_s = 1$. In this case, the event horizon has zero area. However, unlike the case of extreme solutions with a single charge (or two electric charges), the curvature does not diverge at the horizon in the extremal limit. The horizon area vanishes simply because the length in the x direction shrinks to zero. To obtain an extremal solution with nonzero area, we can add momentum along the string. (This provides the third charge upon dimensional reduction to five dimensions.) Since the extremal solution is boost invariant, we cannot add momentum by boosting it. Instead, we start with the nonextremal solution, apply a boost $t = \hat{t}\cosh\sigma + \hat{x}\sinh\sigma,\ x = \hat{x}\cosh\sigma + \hat{t}\sinh\sigma$, and identify $\hat{x}$ with period $2\pi R$. The ADM energy of these solutions is now

$$E = \frac{RV}{2g^2}\left[2(r_+^2 + r_-^2) + \cosh 2\sigma (r_+^2 - r_-^2)\right] \tag{7}$$

and the x component of the ADM momentum is

$$P = \frac{RV}{2g^2}\sinh 2\sigma\ (r_+^2 - r_-^2). \tag{8}$$

The horizon area is now

$$A = 4\pi^3 r_+^2 R\cosh\sigma\sqrt{r_+^2 - r_-^2} \tag{9}$$

and the Hawking temperature is[6]

$$T = \frac{\sqrt{r_+^2 - r_-^2}}{2\pi r_+^2\cosh\sigma} \tag{10}$$

[6]This corrects a misprint in [29].

The extremal limit is obtained by taking $r_- \to r_+$ keeping P fixed, which requires $\sigma \to \infty$. The resulting solutions have energy

$$E_{ext} = E_0 + P \tag{11}$$

Since the energy is increased by an amount equal to the momentum, the effect of boosting and taking the extremal limit is to add a null vector to the total energy-momentum. This can be viewed as adding "right moving" momentum only. In the extremal limit, the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy is

$$S_{BH} = \frac{A}{4G} = 2\pi\sqrt{\frac{r_0^4 VPR}{g^2}} = 2\pi\sqrt{Q_1 Q_5 PR} \tag{12}$$

We now assume that P is quantized $P = n/R$, since this will be the case for the quantum states we wish to count. So the entropy is simply

$$S_{BH} = 2\pi\sqrt{Q_1 Q_5 n} \tag{13}$$

Notice that this expression depends only on the integer charges, and is independent of both the size of the compact directions and the string coupling. The dimensional reduction of this extremal six dimensional black string with momentum yields a five dimensional extremal black hole with the same entropy.

So far we have just discussed properties of a classical solution. We now turn to counting states in string theory. The solution we have described arises in all string theories[7] since they all include a $\mathcal{NS}$ field H. However, the magnetic $\mathcal{NS}$ charge does not have a flat space description, which makes the counting of states difficult. However, one string theory (called Type IIB) has another three form which is a $\mathcal{R}$ field. The solution for the black string is identical, and one can now try to count its states in a weak coupled description. We start with ten dimensional flat space and compactify four dimensions on a torus of volume $(2\pi)^4 V$ and one direction on a circle of length $2\pi R$ which is much larger than the other four. We now ask what objects carry the charges Q_1 and Q_5. It turns out that a D-fivebrane which wraps once around the five torus carries charge $Q_5 = 1$, and a D-string wrapped once around the circle with radius R carries charge $Q_1 = 1$. The black strings discussed above are thus bound states of Q_5 fivebranes and Q_1 strings. If we set $Q_5 = 1$, then the number of such bound states is easy to count. From the six dimensional viewpoint these bound states look like a string with certain degrees of freedom which arise as follows. Although the Q_1 strings are bound to the fivebrane, they are still free to move around in the four internal directions. This yields $4Q_1$ massless bosons together with their superpartners on the $1+1$ dimensional effective field theory on the string. (The massive excitations of the

[7]There have traditionally been five (super) string theories which differ in the gauge groups and amount of supersymmetry one has in ten dimensions. However recent work has shown that these theories are all related by various strong-weak coupling duality transformations.

D-branes have masses proportional to $1/g$ and hence do not play a role at weak coupling. Both the massless and massive degrees of freedom are represented by open strings with ends on the D-branes.) For $Q_5 > 1$, this generalizes to $4Q_1Q_5$ massless bosons. Free fields in $1+1$ dimensions have independent right and left moving modes. BPS states with nonzero momentum correspond to exciting only the right moving modes of these massless fields. So one can simply count the number of states of $4Q_1Q_5$ bosonic fields (plus an equal number of fermionic fields required by supersymmetry) on a circle of radius R with total right moving momentum $P = n/R$. In the limit of large n, the answer is e^S where

$$S = 2\pi\sqrt{Q_1Q_5n} \tag{14}$$

in perfect agreement with the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy (13). We have assumed that one compact direction is much larger than the other four in order to simplify the counting of states, but this is not essential. Since the number of BPS states does not change when the radii are continuously varied, one knows that the entropy is given by (14) for all values of R. When R is small, it is more appropriate to interpret the six dimensional black string as a five dimensional black hole. Notice that from the five dimensional standpoint, the nonzero entropy for an extremal black hole appears to indicate a highly degenerate ground state. However, from the standpoint of the six dimensional string, one has a nondegenerate ground state with $P = 0$, and the horizon area becomes nonzero only when momentum is added.

To describe the states of slightly nonextremal black holes, one keeps exactly the same degrees of freedom as before, but now allows them to carry both left and right moving momentum. These are no longer BPS states, and the counting cannot be done for all values of R. However, when R is large, the modes carrying the momentum have very low energy and one would expect interactions between left and right moving modes to be negligible even as one turns up the string coupling. If one considers states with left moving momenta $P_L = n_L/R$ and right moving momenta $P_R = n_R/R$ then, since the total entropy of noninteracting systems is additive, one obtains

$$S = 2\pi\sqrt{Q_1Q_5}(\sqrt{n}_R + \sqrt{n}_L) \tag{15}$$

in the limit of large $n_R,\ n_L$. It may seem difficult for an expression like this to arise in the context of black hole entropy since the area involves one square root, not the sum of two square roots. Nevertheless, (15) also agrees with the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy, as can be seen as follows. To first order away from extremality, $r_\pm = r_0 \pm \epsilon$, the horizon area (9) becomes

$$A = 8\pi^3 r_0^2 R \cosh\sigma\sqrt{r_0\epsilon} \tag{16}$$

Let δE denote the ADM energy of the black string above the zero momentum

ground state i.e. $\delta E = E - E_0$, and define left and right moving momenta by

$$P_R = \frac{n_R}{R} \equiv \frac{1}{2}(\delta E + P) \qquad P_L = \frac{n_L}{R} \equiv \frac{1}{2}(\delta E - P) \tag{17}$$

so $P_R - P_L = P$. Then it turns out that $n_R \propto e^{2\sigma}$, $n_L \propto e^{-2\sigma}$ and the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy obtained from (16) becomes precisely (15). This expression is valid when both the energy density $\delta E/R$ and momentum density P/R are small. The integers n_R and n_L can still be large since R is large. So we end up with a remarkably simply picture of black string states in terms of free fields on a circle which describe both extremal and near extremal configurations.

IV. Discussion

It is ironic that an extremal black hole was the first example for which it was explicitly shown that the number of states is $e^{A/4G}$. It was argued recently [39] that extremal black holes should have zero entropy even if they have nonzero area. This was based on the fact that the analytic continuation of an extreme black hole has a different topology than the analytic continuation of a nonextreme hole. For a nonextreme black hole, regularity at the horizon fixes the periodicity of the euclidean time coordinate, and the topology is $R^2 \times S^2$. For an extreme black hole, since the horizon is infinitely far away one can periodically identify the euclidean time direction with any period and the topology is $S^1 \times R \times S^2$. In a semiclassical approximation, the entropy is related to the action of the euclidean black hole solution by

$$S = \left(\beta \frac{d}{d\beta} - 1\right) I_E \tag{18}$$

where β is the periodicity of the euclidean time at infinity. The entropy is nonzero only if the action contains a contribution which is not proportional to β. For stationary configurations in ordinary field theory, $I_E = \beta H$ where H is the hamiltonian, and the entropy is zero. For a nonextreme black hole, since the stationary surfaces all intersect at the horizon, it is convenient to write the action as the sum of a contribution from a small neighborhood of the horizon and the contribution from everything outside. This second term is indeed proportional to β, but the first is not and yields the familiar result $S = A/4G$. However an extreme black hole seems analogous to ordinary field theory. The stationary surfaces do not intersect, the action is proportional to β, and the entropy would appear to be zero.

String theory offers a natural resolution of this apparent contradiction[8]. Consider a Reissner-Nordström solution with large charge. The curvature of the euclidean solution is everywhere small, so one expects that string corrections should

[8]The following argument was developed in discussions with A. Sen.

be negligible. While this shows that there is an exact solution of this form, it is not stable. For any periodicity β at infinity, the length of the euclidean time direction goes to zero asymptotically as one approaches the horizon. This means that it must eventually become of order the string scale. At this point, the partition function diverges. One can interpret this divergence as resulting from the fact that a winding mode of the string which wraps around this circle becomes massless [40]. When the circle becomes smaller than the string scale, this mode becomes tachyonic. The original euclidean Reissner-Nordström metric corresponds to a solution in which this mode has been strictly set to zero. This is clearly unstable in the region where it becomes tachyonic. So one expects that the stable description of the extreme black hole will resemble the Reissner-Nordström solution in the region where the euclidean time circles are larger than the string scale, but differ significantly beyond this point. In particular, there is no reason to expect the topology to remain $S^1 \times R \times S^2$. Since the modification to the geometry is likely to involve string scale curvature, it is difficult to describe the stable solution explicitly. However, two things are clear: (1) Some modification of the solution must occur at the string scale since this is directly analogous to the Hagadorn transition which has been well studied for strings at finite temperature in flat spacetime. (2) Since the modification always occurs at the string scale, it is likely to give a contribution to the action which is independent of β and hence lead to a nonzero entropy. It would be nice to show explicitly that the stable solution leads to $S = A/4G$, e.g. by showing that the stable solution has the same topology as the nonextremal black hole.

We now consider the question of which states are being counted to represent the black hole entropy. For the case of extreme black holes, one simply counts all BPS states in the weakly coupled string theory with the given charges. This is consistent with the fact that the only solutions of the low energy field equations with mass and charge saturating the inequality $M > kQ$ are extreme black holes. (This follows from a positive energy theorem.) Since there is no force between these extremal black holes, there are static solutions describing several extreme black holes, but for a fixed charge, the maximum entropy configuration is a single black hole. Similarly, the maximum number of BPS states arise when the D-branes are bound together, and hence localized to about a string length in spacetime. For the nearly extremal black holes, it is not true that one counts all states in the weakly coupled theory with the same mass and charges. For example, we do not include states obtained by adding very low energy strings which are far from a BPS D-brane bound state. Instead, the states which are counted are just non-BPS excitations of the D-branes. These are still localized to about a string length in spacetime and form a black hole at strong coupling. They can be viewed as the weakly coupled states associated with the near extremal black hole.

As we have discussed, string theory has provided a statistical explanation of the entropy of extremal and nearly extremal black holes. What are the prospects for extending these results to black holes far from extremality, including the

Schwarzschild solution? First note that at finite string coupling g, it is plausible that essentially all perturbative string states with mass $M > 1/g^2 l_s$ (including uncharged states) are black holes [8]. The reason is similar to the old argument that any particle with mass greater than the Planck mass should be a black hole since its Compton wavelength is less than its Schwarzschild radius. In string theory this argument must be modified since the metric is not really well defined unless the curvature is less than the string scale $1/l_s^2$. Since (in four dimensions) the curvature at the horizon of a black hole of mass M is of order $1/(GM)^2$ and Newton's constant is related to l_s by $G \sim g^2 l_s^2$, the metric is well defined at the horizon in string theory provided $M > 1/g^2 l_s$ which is $1/g$ times the Planck mass. One consequence of this argument is that the most massive string states are essentially stable, and decay only through semi-classical Hawking evaporation. One occasionally hears the statement that most massive string states decay very quickly to lighter string states, and only BPS states can be stable. This is based on a perturbative calculation which is not valid at finite string coupling. Gravitational backreaction is strong and forms a black hole.

However, we have already noted that this cannot be the explanation of black hole entropy since the degeneracy of massive perturbative string states only grows like e^M and not e^{M^2}. Clearly, one must also include solitonic states. From our experience with extremal black holes, one might expect that solitons provide the dominant contribution to the entropy. Consider the six dimensional black string discussed in the previous section. We showed that the quantum states of the extremal and near extremal configurations could be understood in terms of a collection of weakly interacting onebranes, fivebranes and strings (carrying the momentum). It turns out that there is a sense in which the general nonextremal solution can also be viewed as composed of weakly interacting objects which include these solitons as well as 'anti-branes' which are just D-branes with the opposite orientation and carrying the opposite sign of the charge [37]. To see this, one first generalizes the solution slightly so that the volume of the internal four torus is no longer constant. Dimensional reduction then yields a five dimensional black hole which depends on six parameters: the mass, three charges, and the asymptotic value of two scalars (which represent the radius of the S^1 and volume of the T^4 in ten dimensions). Alternatively, one can label the solution by its mass, three gauge charges and two 'scalar charges'. One might think that the black hole no-hair theorems would imply that the scalar charges are determined by the gauge charges and are not independent. However, if one normalizes the gauge charges to take integer values, the scalar charges depend on both these integers and the asymptotic values of the scalars. One can then replace these six parameters by a number of branes, anti-branes and strings $(N_1,\ N_{\bar{1}},\ N_5,\ N_{\bar{5}},\ n_R,\ n_L)$ by matching the mass, three gauge charges and two scalar charges of these noninteracting objects with that of the black hole. In terms of these new variables the

Bekenstein-Hawking entropy takes the suggestive form [37]

$$S_{BH} = 2\pi(\sqrt{N_1} + \sqrt{N_{\bar{1}}})(\sqrt{N_5} + \sqrt{N_{\bar{5}}})(\sqrt{n_L} + \sqrt{n_R}) \ . \tag{19}$$

This expression applies to all five dimensional black holes, even the Schwarzschild solution. If one term in each factor vanishes, the black hole is extremal and the entropy agrees with the number of states of this collection of D-branes at weak coupling. If only one of the three factors has both terms nonzero, this entropy can again be shown to correctly count the number of states at weak coupling. What is missing is a general derivation of this expression from counting states of branes, anti-branes and strings when all six are present. There is a similar expression for four dimensional black holes with four different factors corresponding to the different solitons that carry the four different charges [33].

Another open question concerns corrections to the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy formula. This formula gives the leading contribution to the entropy for large black holes. For smaller black holes one expects corrections arising from one loop quantum effects, as well as corrections arising from higher order terms in the classical string equations of motion. The latter contribution is likely to involve integrals of local functions of the curvature over the horizon [41]. These corrections should all be reflected in the counting of quantum string states.

Now that the quantum states associated with black holes have been identified, one can try to resolve the question of whether black holes lose information when they radiate. Hawking has argued that if an extreme black hole absorbs a small amount of energy to become slightly nonextremal, and then radiates back to an extremal state, information is lost. In the weak coupling D-brane description, this corresponds to a low energy closed string state scattering off a BPS configuration of D-branes. This scattering can be computed in perturbation theory and is certainly unitary. However, to resolve the issue of information loss, one must do much more. As we have discussed, as one turns down the string coupling, the horizon size becomes very small compared to the string scale. Spacetime becomes flat, and the black hole is effectively replaced by boundary conditions on the D-brane. The region of spacetime behind the horizon is not represented in this weak coupling description. It is hardly surprising that information is not lost in a context where there is no place for it to go! Although it may be possible to relate this D-brane description to what is seen by observers who stay outside a black hole (at strong coupling), it is clearly not sufficient to describe what happens to observers who fall in.

In order to have a complete understanding of the information puzzle, it is necessary to establish stronger links between the flat space D-brane picture, and the black hole picture. One possible approach is the following. The extremal limit of the six dimensional black string (5) has an unusual global structure. This spacetime has a (degenerate) horizon, but is completely nonsingular [38]. The region of spacetime behind the horizon is isometric to the region in front. If one starts with this solution and turns down the coupling, one obtains two copies of

Minkowski spacetime, each with a D-brane, but with these D-branes identified[9]. In a sense, one represents the region behind the horizon, and the other represents the region in front. The idea would be to try to modify the usual D-brane perturbation rules so that strings entering from one flat space, could exit into the other. This would correspond to something falling through the horizon. Unfortunately, it is not yet clear how this should be done. Another approach to strengthening the links between the two pictures is to understand what happens to the D-branes when the string coupling is increased. It seems unlikely that the D-branes can stay on the event horizon - like all massive objects, they presumably fall in. At strong coupling, the quantum states are then localized within a string length of the singularity. But what happens in the case of the extremal black string when there is no singularity? Also, if the quantum states are localized near the singularity, how are they connected with Hawking radiation? In the weakly coupled D-brane picture, the natural analog of Hawking radiation is for two open string states on the D-brane to combine, form a closed string, and leave the D-brane. Can one follow this process as the string coupling is increased? Is it related to the familiar semiclassical calculations of black hole radiation for large black holes?

Finally, the explanation of black hole entropy provided by string theory needs to be understood at a deeper level. At the present time, each black hole must be checked by a separate calculation, and the agreement between the number of string states and the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy seems miraculous. There must be some unifying principle which explains why these calculations are working. It is clear that string theory has not yet revealed all of its secrets.

Acknowledgments

It is a pleasure to thank D. Marolf, J. Polchinski, and C. Rovelli for helpful conversations. I also wish to thank my collaborators, D. Lowe, J. Maldacena, and especially A. Strominger for extensive discussions which clarified my understanding and led to some of the results described here. This work was supported in part by NSF Grant PHY95-07065.

[9]Actually, the maximally extended spacetime contains an infinite number of asymptotically flat regions.

References

[1] J. Bardeen, B. Carter, and S. Hawking, Comm. Math. Phys. **31**, 161 (1973).

[2] J. Bekenstein, Lett. Nuov. Cimento **4**, 737 (1972); Phys. Rev. **D7**, 2333 (1973); Phys. Rev. **D9**, 3292 (1974).

[3] S. Hawking, Nature **248**, 30 (1974); Comm. Math. Phys. **43**, 199 (1975).

[4] J. Bekenstein, Phys. Rev **D12**,3077 (1975).

[5] S. Hawking, Phys. Rev **D13**, 191 (1976).

[6] W. Zurek and K. Thorne, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 2171 (1985).

[7] G. 'tHooft, Nucl. Phys. **B335**, 138 (1990); Phys. Scr. **T36**, 247 (1991).

[8] L. Susskind, hep-th/9309145.

[9] L. Susskind and J. Uglum, Phys. Rev. **D50**, 2700 (1994).

[10] J. Bekenstein and V. Mukhanov, Phys. Lett. **B360**, 7 (1995).

[11] A. Sen, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A10**, 2081 (1995).

[12] A. Peet, hep-th/9506200.

[13] C. Teitelboim, Phys. Rev. **D53**, 2870 (1996).

[14] S. Carlip, gr-qc/9509024.

[15] V. Frolov, hep-th/9510156.

[16] F. Larsen and F. Wilczek, hep-th/9511064.

[17] M. Cvetic and A. Tseytlin, hep-th/9512031.

[18] M. Duff, R. Khuri, and J. Lu, Phys. Rep. **259**, 213 (1995).

[19] G. Horowitz and A. Tseytlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 3351 (1994); Phys. Rev. **D51**, 2896 (1995).

[20] R. Khuri and R. Myers, Phys. Rev. **D52**, 6988 (1995).

[21] C. Callan, J. Maldacena, and A. Peet, hep-th/9510134.

[22] J. Polchinski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 4724 (1995).

[23] J. Polchinski, S. Chaudhuri, and C. Johnson, hep-th/9602052.

[24] R. Kallosh, A. Linde, T. Ortin, A. Peet, and A. Van Proeyen, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 5278 (1992); M. Cvetic and D. Youm, Phys. Rev. **D53**, 584 (1996).

[25] A. Strominger and C. Vafa, hep-th/9601029.

[26] S. Carlip, in this volume.

[27] J. Breckenridge, R. Myers, A. Peet and C. Vafa, hep-th/9602065.

[28] C. Callan and J. Maldacena, hep-th/9602043.

[29] G. Horowitz and A. Strominger, hep-th/9602051.

[30] J. Breckenridge, D. Lowe, R. Myers, A. Peet, A. Strominger and C. Vafa, hep-th/9603078.

[31] J. Maldacena and A. Strominger, hep-th/9603060.

[32] C. Johnson, R. Khuri, and R. Myers, hep-th/9603061.

[33] G. Horowitz, D. Lowe, and J. Maldacena, hep-th/9603195.

[34] A. Sen, hep-th/9510229; hep-th/9511026.

[35] C. Vafa, hep-th/9511088.

[36] S. Das and S. Mathur, hep-th/9601152.

[37] G. Horowitz, J. Maldacena, and A. Strominger, hep-th/9603109.

[38] G. Gibbons, G. Horowitz, and P. Townsend, Class. Quantum Grav. **12**, 297 (1995).

[39] S. Hawking, G. Horowitz, and S. Ross, Phys. Rev. **D51**, 4302 (1995); C. Teitelboim, Phys. Rev. **D51** 4315 (1995); G. Gibbons and R. Kallosh, Phys. Rev. **D51**, 2839 (1995).

[40] J. Atick and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B310**, 291 (1988).

[41] R. Wald, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 3427 (1993); T. Jacobson, G. Kang, and R. Myers, **D49**, 6587 (1994).